

Review of: "The Ancient Indian Knowledge System and the Medical Sciences"

Sucharita Sarkar

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article demonstrates a gap between stated intention (in the abstract) and the execution. The author "aims to justify the concepts of ancient Indian medical sciences" but the execution is superficial and inconclusive.

There are several instances of the author jumping from one thread of argument to another point without unpacking or analysing the argument. For instance, the author claims, "In addition to authoritative texts, ancient India employed an intriguing pedagogical approach, passing down wisdom, morals, and knowledge through stories." Without any examples or analyses of any such "story" the author jumps to the next section, "Attributes of Mind According to Ancient Medical System." Similarly, in another part of the article, the author states, "In other words, the pursuit of so-called "peace of mind" or similar aims should not become the primary objectives of spiritual practice. This presents a paradox." Without explaining or critiquing this "paradox" the author moves to the next section, "Archeological Record of Medical Practice". Such abrupt, uncritical transitions are not expected in an academic paper, and they leave the reader dissatisfied with the lack of analysis.

There are also several claims made in the paper that are not backed by any cited evidence. For instance, the author states, "The CDRS achieved significant success within a relatively short period of five and a half years in the areas of pharmacognostic, pharmacological, and phytochemical studies" without citing any specific instance of such successful studies. Again, in the section, "Archeological Record of Medical Practice," the author refers to certain archaeological findings of this pre-Vedic era, but does not develop or cite any evidence of their connections with the Vedic and Ayurvedic knowledge systems that is the subject of the paper.

Some other claims are also speculative rather than conclusive. For instance, in the section, "Spread Of Indian Knowledge." the author surmises that "it is not surprising that knowledge from India disseminated to these areas," without conclusive proof. It is best to insert a disclaimer that such theories are hypothetical.

In the conclusion, the author states that "This paper provides an overview of the Nadi-E-Health Analysis," yet the actual idescription and investigation of "nadi pariksha" as a traditional Indian practice that is still relevant in contemporary medicine is very rudimentary.

There is no doubt that the topic of the article is a significant area of medical research that deserves scholarly attention and further research, both at the theoretical and practical levels. However, the author needs to improve this article by working upon the reviewers' suggestions and rewriting it in order to contribute to the growing body of research on the relevance

and continuity of ancient Indian medical practices in contemporary times.